UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/566,297	01/11/2007	Rainer Berghaus	0690-0127PUS1	9833
2292 7590 05/14/2009 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040 0747			EXAMINER	
			KLINKEL, KORTNEY L	
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1611	·
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/14/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/566,297	BERGHAUS ET AL.	
Notice of Abandonment	Examiner	Art Unit	, <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>
	Kortney L. Klinkel	1611	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app			dress
This application is abandoned in view of:			
Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office (a) ☐ A reply was received on (with a Certificate of M period for reply (including a total extension of time of, but it does not be a proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on, but it does not proposed reply was received on	failing or Transmission dated month(s)) which expired on), which is after the	
(A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C	n consists only of: (1) a timely filed ar Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); o	mendment which pla	aces the
(c) A reply was received on but it does not constitutional rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See		mpt at a proper rep	ly, to the non-
(d) 🛮 No reply has been received.			
 2. Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-8: (a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was	5). received on (with a Certifica	ate of Mailing or Tr	ansmission dated
(b) ☐ The submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. A balance	e of \$ is due.		
The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$	The publication fee, if required by 37	CFR 1.18(d), is \$	
(c) \square The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has no	ot been received.		
 3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as requal Allowability (PTO-37). (a) Proposed corrected drawings were received on 			
after the expiration of the period for reply.	_(with a Certificate of Mailing of Tran	SIIIISSIOII dated	
(b) ☐ No corrected drawings have been received.			
 The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the the applicants. 	e attorney or agent of record, the ass	ignee of the entire i	nterest, or all of
5. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.	attorney or agent (acting in a repres	entative capacity ur	nder 37 CFR
6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claim		e the period for see	eking court review
7. X The reason(s) below:			
The law offices of Birch Stewart Kolasch and Birch on 3/17/2009.	confirmed the abandonment of th	e application in a	telephone call
/Sharmila Gollamudi Landau/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1611	/Kortney L. Klinkel/ Examiner, Art Unit 1611		
Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdra	w the holding of abandonment under 37 (CFR 1.181, should be	promptly filed to